

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Docket No. 7032

Joint Petition of Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc. (“VELCO”), Green Mountain Power Corporation (“GMP”) and the Town of Stowe Electric Department (“Stowe”) for a Certificate of Public Good pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248 authorizing VELCO to upgrade a substation in Moretown, Vermont; construct .3 miles of side by side, single pole tap; construct a switching station in Duxbury, Vermont; construct 9.4 miles of 115 kV transmission line; upgrade an existing GMP 34.5 kV subtransmission line; construct a substation in Stowe, Vermont; and for Stowe to construct 1.05 miles of 34.5 kV subtransmission line in Stowe, Vermont.

**PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
HUGH H. HENRY**

**ON BEHALF OF
VERMONT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY, INC.**

Mr. Henry’s rebuttal testimony discusses the testimony of Department of Public Service witness, David Raphael, and of Vermont Division for Historic Preservation witness, Judith Ehrlich, which introduced the April 11, 2005 comments of the Division.

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Docket No. 7032

Joint Petition of Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc. (“VELCO”), Green Mountain Power Corporation (“GMP”) and the Town of Stowe Electric Department (“Stowe”) for a Certificate of Public Good pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248 authorizing VELCO to upgrade a substation in Moretown, Vermont; construct .3 miles of side by side, single pole tap; construct a switching station in Duxbury, Vermont; construct 9.4 miles of 115 kV transmission line; upgrade an existing GMP 34.5 kV subtransmission line; construct a substation in Stowe, Vermont; and for Stowe to construct 1.05 miles of 34.5 kV subtransmission line in Stowe, Vermont.

**PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
HUGH H. HENRY**

**ON BEHALF OF
VERMONT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY, INC.**

1 Q1. Have you previously filed testimony in this docket?

2 A1. Yes, in collaboration with T.J. Boyle and Associates.

3

4 Q2. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

5 A2. I provide comments on the prefiled testimony of David Raphael on behalf of the
6 Department of Public Service (Exhibit DPS-DR-1) regarding the prefiled Henry-Boyle
7 report and testimony (VELCO Exhibit HHH-2). I also discuss the Vermont Division for
8 Historic Preservation testimony of Judith Ehrlich, which introduced the April 11, 2005
9 comments of the Division.

10

1 Q3. How many historic properties have you discovered within the viewshed of the Lamoille
2 County Project?

3 A3. There exist one individual historic property in Duxbury, ten individual historic properties
4 in Waterbury, and two historic districts (Moscow and Lower Village) plus two individual
5 properties in Stowe.
6

7 Q4. Did your analysis of the historic properties in Waterbury omit the Waterbury Reservoir?

8 A4. No. The proposed 115 kV and rebuilt 34.5 kV transmission lines will cross the east or
9 Waterbury Center arm of the body of water known as the Waterbury Reservoir. I have
10 inspected the crossing site, and discovered that there are not any historic architectural or
11 structural properties relating to the reservoir within the viewshed at that crossing. The
12 standard treatment in the Henry-Boyle report does not mention the *lack* of such historic
13 properties at any specific location.
14

15 Q5. When was the Waterbury Dam constructed to impound the body of water known as the
16 Waterbury Reservoir, and what is its status relative to the State Register of Historic
17 Places?

18 A5. The Waterbury Dam proper was constructed originally during 1935-38 and then raised
19 during 1956-59. The dam retains sufficient historic structural integrity to appear eligible
20 for listing in both the State and National Register(s) of Historic Places.
21

22 Q6. Why did your prefiled testimony not include the Waterbury Dam?

23 A6. The dam stands in the main valley of the Little River, about 1.5 miles west of the
24 transmission line crossing of the tributary arm of the reservoir. An intervening hill
25 blocks any view of the proposed transmission line(s) from the dam. Therefore, being
26 outside the viewshed of the proposed project, the Waterbury Dam was not treated in the
27 Henry-Boyle report and my prefiled testimony.
28

1 Q7. Have you read the testimony of the Division for Historic Preservation in this docket?

2 A7. Yes, I have.
3

4 Q8. Did that testimony raise any concerns for you?

5 A8. Yes. The testimony referred to my report as proposing H-frame structures “no taller than
6 50 feet,” when my report actually said “about 50 feet.” While the change in wording is
7 minor, I consider it important because, in fact, such structures may have to be slightly
8 taller than 50 feet in some locations for engineering and safety reasons.
9

10 Q9. What did you do to clarify this issue?

11 A9. I addressed my concern through VELCO’s attorney in a letter dated April 20, 2005 to the
12 Division. On May 10, 2005, Jane Lendway, the State Historic Preservation Officer,
13 wrote to VELCO’s attorney stating that she has agreed to alter the proposed mitigation
14 for resources W-5 and W-7 to read that there will be no adverse effect to these historic
15 resources if a change is made to “about 50 feet.” I have attached a copy of that letter,
16 Exhibit VELCO Rebuttal HHH-1.
17

18 Q10. Does this conclude your testimony?

19 A10. Yes.